

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on

June 18, 2002
Quine Intellectual Property Law Group, P.C.

By:

Chianf Appling

Atty Docket No: 407T-897900US #

Client Ref: 99-140-1

TECH CENTER 160012900

JUL 03 2002

RECEIVED



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of:

**DONNA G. ALBERTSON, DANIEL PINKEL,
COLIN COLLINS, JOE W. GRAY and
BAUKE YSTRA**

Examiner: Alana M.. Harris

Application No.: **09/285,292**

Art Unit: 1642

Filed: **04/02/1999**

For: **AMPLIFICATION OF CYP24 AND
USES THEREOF**

AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated 18 December 2001, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following amendments and remarks. The following documents are enclosed herewith:

- 1) A petition to extend the period of response for three months;

REMARKS

Status of the Claims.

Claims 1-32 are pending with entry of this response, no claims being cancelled and no claims being added herein.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph.

Claims 15 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite in their use of the phrase "... statistically significant difference". The Examiner noted that Applicants previously traversed the rejection citing language from the specification in support of the phrase "statistically significant difference." The Examiner asserted, however, that Applicants have not

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED